

REMARKS

The application included claims 1-10, 18 and 20-38 prior to entering this amendment.

The examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 7-10 and 30-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Blickenstaff (US Patent No. 5,832,522).

The examiner rejected claims 3-6 and 24-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Blickenstaff in view of Papatla *et al.* (U.S. Patent 7,379,996).

Claims 1-9, 24 and 26-37 are amended.

Claims 10, 18, 20-23, 25, and 35 are cancelled.

The application remains with claims 1-9, 18, 24, and 26-38 after entering this amendment.

The applicant makes the above amendments without prejudice or disclaimer to delineate more clearly intended subject matter. Accordingly, the applicant does not intend to surrender claimed subject matter by submission of the above amendments and does not add new matter. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above referenced patent application in view of the following remarks.

Examiner Interview Summary

On January 13, 2010, Examiner El Chanti and representative for the applicants, attorney, Michelle C. Craig engaged in an Examiner Interview. Examiner El Chanti and Applicants discussed proposed amendments to claim 1 submitted to the examiner by the applicants. Also discussed were the references Papatla *et al.* (U.S. Patent 7,379,996) and Blickenstaff (U.S. Patent 5,832,522). The examiner and applicants agreed that the proposed amendments to claim 1 distinguish from the references. Claim 1 is currently amended to incorporate the proposed amendments.

The applicants thank the examiner for his agreement and time participating in the interview.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 7-10 and 30-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Blickenstaff. The applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least

the reasons explained herein and requests that the examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, 7-10 and 30-38 for these reasons.

Claims 10 and 35 are cancelled.

As noted above, the applicants and examiner reached an agreement in the examiner interview of January 13, 2010 that proposed amendments to claim 1 distinguish from the references Blickenstaff and Papatla. Claim 1 is currently amended to incorporate the proposed amendments discussed. Thus, claim 1 and dependent claims should be allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The examiner rejected claims 3-6 and 24-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Blickenstaff in view of Papatla *et al.* (U.S. Patent 7,379,996). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the reasons explained herein and requests that the examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 3-6 and 24-29 for these reasons.

Claim 25 is cancelled.

As noted above, the applicants and examiner reached an agreement in the examiner interview of January 13, 2010 that proposed amendments to claim 1 distinguish from the references Blickenstaff and Papatla. Claims 1 and 24 are currently amended to incorporate the proposed amendments discussed. Thus, claims 3-6 depending from claim 1 and claim 24 and respective dependent claims should be allowed.

The applicant believes that the claimed subject matter is patentably distinguishable from Blickenstaff and Papatla for additional reasons; however, because the forgoing is believed to be sufficient, the applicants choose to omit them at this time. Likewise, the applicant's failure to comment directly upon any of the positions asserted in the current office action does not indicate agreement or acquiescence with those asserted positions. Rather, the assertions are rendered moot by the foregoing and, therefore, it is not necessary to respond to every position taken in the office action with which the applicant does not agree.

Examiner Interview

The applicants hereby respectfully request that the Examiner grant the undersigned a telephonic interview prior to issuing the next office action to help expedite prosecution. To this end, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (503) 224-2170 ex. 210 to schedule an interview at the examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the applicants request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-9, 18, 24, and 26-38. The applicants amend claims in this response without prejudice or disclaimer solely to expedite allowance. The applicants explicitly reserve the right to pursue cancelled, withdrawn or amended subject matter in one or more continuation applications. The applicants encourage the examiner to telephone the undersigned if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 73552

Respectfully submitted,

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP

/Michelle C. Craig/

Michelle C. Craig
Reg. No. 52,776

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 224-2170